# Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology (ESEA, Title III, Subpart 1, Sec. 3122)

Goal: To improve the knowledge and ability of future teachers to use technology in improved teaching practices and student learning opportunities, and to improve the quality of teacher preparation programs.

**Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives:** This initiative supports Objective 1.4 (A talented and dedicated teacher is in every classroom in America) and Objective 1.7 (Schools use advanced technology for all students and teachers to improve education) by providing competitive grants to consortia that are implementing improvements in teacher preparation programs.

FY 2000--\$75,000,000 FY 2001--\$XXXXXXX (Requested budget)

Objective 1: Strengthen teacher preparation programs so that they provide high quality training in the use of technology for instructional purposes.

Indicators, Targets, & Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
1.1 Curriculum redesign. The percentage of teacher			Status:	Sources:
preparation programs that redesign their curriculum to			Unable to judge	Project Performance Reports
	1 0	the use of technology in		Frequency: annual
	er education will increa	<b></b>	Explanation:	Next Update: Dec. 2000
icacii	er education will increa	sc.	This is a new program so	
			performance data are not yet	Formative Evaluation
	formance:		available.	Frequency: longitudinal
	ew program for 1999.	D. C. T.		Next Update: 2000
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		Summative Evaluation
1999:		No target set		Frequency: longitudinal
2000:		Continuous increase		Next Update: 2002
2001:		Continuous increase		Next Opaule. 2002
				Validation Procedures:
				Evaluation data collection will be
				verified by: on-site monitoring and
				review; and survey and analyses
				performed by an experienced data
				collection agency with internal
				review procedures.
				<b>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:</b>
				Performance report data will be self-reported from
				program grantees. ED does not collect national level
				baseline data for this indicator.

	Indicators, Targets, & I	Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
1.2 Technology-proficient faculty. The percentage of			Status:	Sources:
facult	ty members in teacher p	reparation programs that	Unable to judge	Project Performance Reports
effect	tively use technology in t	their teaching will increase.	Evalenctions	Frequency: annual
	·		Explanation: This is a new program so	Next Update: Dec. 2000
	rformance: ew program for 1999.		performance data are not yet	Summative Evaluation
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	available.	Frequency: longitudinal Next Update: 2002
1999:	_	No target set		Iven opune. 2002
2000:		Continuous increase		Validation Procedures:
2001:	2001: Continuous increase			Evaluation data collection will be
				verified by: on-site monitoring and
				review; and survey and analyses
				performed by an experienced data
				collection agency with internal
				review procedures.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:
				Performance report data will be self-reported from
				program grantees. ED does not collect national level
				baseline data for this indicator.

	Indicators, Targets, & 1	Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
1.3 Grad	luation requirements. T	he number of teacher	Status:	Sources:
preparation programs that will require teacher			Unable to judge.	Project Performance Reports
	1 0	roficiency in the effective		Frequency: annual
	_	and learning will increase.	Explanation:	Next Up date: Dec. 2000
use of	i technology in teaching	and learning win increase.	This is a new program so	
			program-specific performance	Summative Evaluation
	rformance:		data are not yet available.	Frequency: longitudinal
	ew program for 1999.	D. C	However, related national-level	Next Update: 2002
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	data are available from Education Week's report,	Education Week's "Technology Counts"
1999:		No target set	"Technology Counts."	Frequency: annual
2000:		Continuous increase	According to "Technology	Next Update: fall 2000
2001:		Continuous increase	Counts '99," 42 states require	Next Opaate. Tail 2000
			teacher preparation programs to	Validation Procedures:
			include technology. Two	"Technology Counts": data
			limitations to these data are: (1)	corroborated by internal review
			preparation requirements vary	procedures of an experienced data
			widely among states; and (2)	collection agency.
			inclusion of technology in	
			teacher preparation does not	Evaluation data collection will be
			imply that new teachers are	verified by: on-site monitoring and
			technology-proficient.	review; and survey and analyses
				performed by an experienced data
				collection agency with internal
				review procedures.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:
				Performance report data will be self-reported from
				program grantees.

	Indicators, Targets, & Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
1.4 Learning resources. The percentage of teacher preparation programs that use web-based, multi-media learning resources, course materials and teaching tools will increase.			Status: No 1999 data but progress toward target is likely.  Explanation:	Sources: Project Performance Reports Frequency: annual Next Update: Dec. 2000
	formance:		This is a new program so	Summative Evaluation
Year	ew program for 1999.  Actual Performance	Performance Targets	performance data are not yet	Frequency: longitudinal
1999:	Actual I Ci Ioi munec	No target set	available.	Next Update: 2002
2000:		Continuous increase		Validation Procedures:
2001:		Continuous increase		Evaluation data collection will be verified by: on-site monitoring and review; and survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Performance report data will be self-reported from program grantees. ED does not collect national level baseline data for this indicator.

Objective 2: Increase the technology skills and proficiency of new teachers for improved classroom instruction.

Indicators, Targets, & Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
2.1 Techi	nology-proficient new te	achers. The percentage of	Status:	Sources:
new teachers who are proficient in using technology			Unable to judge.	Project Performance Reports
and in	ntegrating technology in	nto instructional practices		Frequency: annual
	ncrease.	<b>.</b>	Explanation:	Next Update: Dec. 2000
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	ner case.		This is a new program so	
	e		program-specific performance	Summative Evaluation
Actual Per			data are not yet available.	Frequency: longitudinal
	w program for 1999.	D 6 /D 4	However, related national-level	Next Update: 2002
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	data are available for this	NGES Total of Consider A Department of the Department
1999:		No target set	indicator from the NCES report,	NCES, Teacher Quality: A Report on the Preparation
2000:		Continuous increase	Teacher Quality: A Report on	and Qualifications of Public School Teachers, 1998
2001:		Continuous increase	the Preparation and Qualifications of Public School	Frequency: every 2 years  Next Update: Jan. 2001
			Teachers. According to this	Next Opaate. Jan. 2001
			report, in 1998, only 24 percent	Validation Procedures:
			of new teachers (with 0-3 years	Teacher Quality: Data validated by
			of teaching experience) felt	NCES's review procedures and
			"very well prepared" to integrate	NCES Statistical Standards.
			educational technology in the	Evaluation data collection will be
			grade or subject they taught.	verified by: on-site monitoring and
				review; and survey and analyses
				performed by an experienced data
				collection agency with internal
				review procedures.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:
				Performance report data will be self-reported from
				program grantees.

Objective 3: Create institutional change in the preparation of future teachers to use technology.

	Indicators, Targets, &	Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
3.1 Susta	nined program activities	. At least 35 percent of	Status:	Source:
		will continue to implement	Unable to judge.	Summative Evaluation
		training for at least two		Frequency: longitudinal
	s following the terminati	_	Explanation:	Next Update: 2002
years	s tonowing the terminati	on of federal funding.	This is a new program so	
			performance data are not yet	Validation Procedures:
	rformance:		available.	Evaluation data collection will be
	ew program for 1999.		]	verified by: on-site monitoring and
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		review; and survey and analyses
1999:		No target set		performed by an experienced data
2000:		35 percent of program consortia		collection agency with internal
		whose federal funding has ended		review procedures.
	will continue to implement reform in pre-service teacher training			Limitations of Data and Dlannad Improvements:
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:  ED does not collect national level baseline data for this
				indicator.
2001:	<b>2001:</b> 40 percent of program consortia			indicator.
		whose federal funding has ended		
		will continue to implement		
		reform in pre-service teacher		
2002		training		
2002:				
		whose federal funding has ended		
		will continue to implement		
		reform in pre-service teacher		
		training		

	Indicators, Targets, & l	Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
3.2 Inter-disciplinary partnerships. The percentage of teacher preparation programs that communicate, collaborate and partner together with schools of arts and sciences on a regular and formal basis will increase.  Actual Performance:			Status: Unable to judge.  Explanation: This is a new program so performance data are not yet	Sources: Project Performance Reports Frequency: annual Next Update: Dec. 2000  Formative Evaluation Frequency: longitudinal
	ew program for 1999.		available.	Next Update: 2000
Year				1
1999:		No target set		Summative Evaluation
2000:		Continuous increase		Frequency: longitudinal
2001:		Continuous increase		Next Update: 2002
				Validation Procedures: Evaluation data collection will be verified by: on-site monitoring and review; and survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures.  Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Performance report data will be self-reported from program grantees. ED does not collect national level baseline data for this indicator.

	Indicators, Targets, & l	Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
3.3 K-16 partnerships. The percentage of teacher preparation programs that communicate, collaborate, and partner together with the K-12 community on a regular and formal basis will increase.  Actual Performance:  This is a new program for 1999.			Status: Unable to judge.  Explanation: This is a new program so performance data are not yet available.	Sources: Project Performance Reports Frequency: annual Next Update: Dec. 2000  Formative Evaluation Frequency: longitudinal Next Update: 2000
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1999:		No target set		Summative Evaluation
2000:		Continuous increase		Frequency: longitudinal
2001:		Continuous increase		Next Update: 2002
				Validation Procedures: Evaluation data collection will be verified by: on-site monitoring and review; and survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures.  Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Performance report data will be self-reported from program grantees. ED does not collect national level baseline data for this indicator.

Objective 4: Create statewide change in the preparation of future teachers to use technology.

Indicators, Targets, & Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
		ndards. The percentage of	Status:	Sources:
states that include technology proficiency as a			No 1999 data but progress	Milken Exchange on Education Technology's report,
comp	onent of their initial tea	cher certification	toward target is likely.	"Education Technology Policies of the 50 States"  Frequency: one-time survey
stand	lards will increase.		Explanation:	Next Update: unknown
			Data from the Milken report	
Actual Per	formance:		includes states that require	Project Performance Reports
Percentage	e of states that have technology	related requirements as a	teachers to meet a technology	Frequency: annual
component	of their initial teacher certific	ation standards.	requirement either through credit	Next Update: Dec. 2000
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	hours of coursework, or through	
	States with technology		a performance-based assessment.	Summative Evaluation
	related requirement		D . 6 1000	Frequency: longitudinal
1998:	15		Data for 1999 are not available	Next Update: 2002
1999:		15 states	from any of the data sources for	Validation Procedures:
2000:		18 states	this indicator. However, 1998 data from the Milken report	,
2001:		20 states	data from the Winken report demonstrate that in addition to	"Education Technology Policies of the 50 States": data supplied by the
			the 15 states that currently have	Milken Exchange on Education
			technology requirements for	Policy; data corroborated by
			certification, 7 states are in the	internal review procedures of an
			process of adopting standards.	experienced data collection agency.
			This indicates that progress is	
			likely in increasing the	Evaluation data collection will be
			percentage of states meeting this	verified by: on-site monitoring and
			goal.	review; and survey and analyses
				performed by an experienced data
				collection agency with internal review procedures.
				Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:
				Performance report data will be self-reported from
				program grantees.

#### **Key Strategies**

Strategies continued from 1999

- To address the use of effective practices for teacher preparation programs, the program office will encourage the sharing of information among grantees through a peer collaboration process and the development of a grantee website.
- To address reporting requirements, the program office will provide technical assistance to grantees on such topics as evaluation, and it will ensure accurate interpretation of program activities and requirements.
- To address the outreach and communication efforts of the Department, the program office will work with professional organizations to promote program goals through participation in national, state and regional conferences. The program office will also sponsor workshops to help potential applicants learn about the program and facilitate the sharing of information on effective strategies across consortium grantees.

## **How This Program Coordinates with Other Federal Activities**

- To address the issue of evaluation, the program office will continue to work with ED's Office of Education Technology to coordinate and participate in national conferences such as the Secretary's Conference on Educational Technology: "Evaluation the Effectiveness of Technology."
- To address teacher quality, the program office will coordinate with the Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants program to collaborate on common issues of preparedness, certification, and technology.

#### **Challenges to Achieving Program Goal**

None.

## **Indicator Changes**

From two year old Annual Plan (FY 1999)

**Adjusted** 

None.

Dropped

None.

From last year's Annual Plan (FY 2000)

Adjusted

None.

Dropped

None.

New

❖ All indicators are new to the FY 2001 Annual Plan